AN ACCOUNT OF Dr. *Still.*'s late BOOK AGAINST *The Church of* ROME.

Together

With a ſhort Poſtil upon His TEXT.

Non omnia ſunt quæ videntur, nec videntur omnia quæ ſunt.

1672.

TO

KATHOLIKΩ

Stillingfleeton.

THe Book, Sir, which taken up with better affairs, you ſent unto me, that I might, after I had read it over, draw an Abridgment of it for you, with my own thoughts ſuper-added in the cloſe, by way of a ſhort Comment thereon, is the ſecond production, as it ſeems, of Doctor *Stillingfleet* againſt Popery. Leſs diſpleaſing it is I think to a Reader, and nothing ſo tireſome, as ſome other Books which have iſſued forth on that Side againſt the ways of Catholick Religion. For there is ſome Truth in his Citations, a ſeaſoning of Salt and comical Wittineſs ſprinkled all over; and no ſuch thick groſs venom of maliciouſneſs, wherewith other Books of that kind are overcharged, appearing, though much of it lie hid, throughout his Book. Indeed he perverts all things by his various ſubtilty: But that is no more, but what his own fame and

 intereſt

nterest, here principally aimed at, would re-uire. And we must give him leave to de-ide also, and play and sport himself in his Book, as a Leviathan in his own waters. It s his pastime and pleasure, and a sweetness qsteemed perhaps necessary to his life. And who would be so ill-natur'd as to envy it him? Besides, it is a pretty piece of Rhetorick, both fit and very efficacious to create in his Protestant Readers an opinion of his unerring confidence, which is the one great end of his Labours. And if we be thus kind, he will in recompence of that our civility, give leave I suppose to Catholicks, who see him so jocund and supinely careless in his errours, thence to conclude the strange inconsiderate security of the merry man.

But we must know, Sir, that this his elaborate Book against the Church of *Rome*, as he speaks, although it be his second, yet is it not intended to be his last: For, *If Catholicks have any thing to say*, quoth he, *either against our Church, or in defence of their own, let them come into the open Field, from whence they have of late so wisely withdrawn themselves, finding so little success in it.* Thus he speaks in his Preface, threatning (if I understand him right) another Knocker, as stout a one as this can be, if any one dare to appear against him, or say so much as *Bob* to a Goose.

And

And these words of his, import I think a Challenge, called commonly a Defiance; which Catholicks as soon as they had read, thought it as much their duty, as it sounded to be the Doctors desire, to fit their Slings unto their Arms, and meet him. But the thing proved alas to be but a Copy of the Doctors Countenance, quite differing from his heart. For the Presses, guarded enough before against Catholicks, was presently within a month after his Book came forth, so stoutly beset, so frequently invaded, so violently searched night and day, especially by the industry of one of them, who entring into the Printing-houses, cried out aloud, *And what! have ye here any thing against the Doctor Stillingfleet? hah!* that what before was difficil, and extreamly dangerous, was now become impossible. So that I believe no Catholick in *England* can do him the favour which the Doctor thirsts after so earnestly in his Lips. He challenged the Papists for his Credit, and stopt up their way for his Security: He would first make the world believe they cannot answer him, and then provides that they shall not. This seems to be his mind.

And yet I think, Sir, there be few Protestant Gentlemen in *England* who desire not as earnestly as any Catholick, to see some Re-

ply to his Book: So little do they think themselves concerned in a Scroll which neither defends their Religion, nor hurts or touches ours; wherein nothing is said, but what might as well be spoken by a *Mahometan*, *Jew*, or *Pagan*; and the most part of that which is put to disable Catholick Religion, diminishes Christianity it self. Some of them offered themselves to print a Reply for us: But they offered but words. For they found that the Bishop durst not give a License to any of our Catholick Books, onely so far as to secure the Printer from danger; although the Doctor be a Foe to their Rank and Order, and Catholick Religion a Friend. This is, truly Sir, a very sad case, that they can freely give one a License to defame men, and yet dare not give others a License to clear themselves. Doctor *Cousins* when he was in *Paris*, spake up and down so freely against Catholick Religion, that their Clergy hearing of it, came to him, and told him plainly, *That if he had ought to say against their Religion, they would both get him a License from the Bishop to print his Book, and themselves pay the whole charges, and then answer him when they had done, for his satisfaction.* But we poor Creatures can obtain no favour in our own Countrey, no leave to speak or justifie ourselves, no License to print a Book for our

defence,

defence, when we are both ſcurrilouſly libelled, and falſely ſlandered, and imperiouſly challenged to anſwer: Nor is there any open field for our poor men to come forth into, that I know of, but *Tybourn*; and that is perhaps the Doctors meaning. It does mightily amaze our Catholicks all over the Land, to have their ears thus beaten with ſlanders, which are both of a high nature, and ſtill notoriouſly falſe, year by year, without any end; thereby to make us odious to our Neighbours, and them to God. Our bleſſed Lord have pity on us; and either open, if it may be thy will, our Magiſtrates hearts towards us, or ſtop the Miniſters mouths againſt us; that our good Name and Peace may return unto thy great Glory. We are, if we be ſilent, proclaimed guilty; and if we ſpeak, inſolent. What can we do, Sir, here, but ſtill commend our ſelves unto our heavenly Lord, who miraculouſly preſerves us. We do either ſubſiſt after this life, or not. Our Proteſtant Countrey-men muſt needs believe one of theſe two things: Either ſome Religion is true, or it is all a fiction. If it be all a fiction, and there is no life to come, then are they as guilty as we, nay ſomething more; for they have taken away our Churches from us, for themſelves to diſſemble in. If there be a life to come, and this everlaſting, then can there

certainly be nothing of greater importance in this world, than to know, when many ways are pretended to it, which of them is the moſt authentick and trueſt, wherein we may be both happy and ſafe for ever. Why then are we, who are the firſt, not permitted to ſpeak, while all others are permitted to blaſpheme us? If we prove to go amiſs, the danger is our own: and if we be in the right, it cannot be any danger unto them to know it. All the poſitive things of Religion which any of them do keep, they have them all from us, we borrow nothing from them. And the negative points which ſeparate them from us, ſeem to us as falſe and impious, as they can poſſibly appear true to them. They have as many Articles to believe as we, onely ſome of them which made the ſeparation are affirmative to us, and negative to them: And one Affirmers word is to be taken in Judgment before ten Deniers. And yet will they neither read our Books, nor ſuffer us to print any, when we are falſified, and miſ-interpreted, and challenged and obliged to do it, for fear I think our Religion ſhould prove true. All rejoyce when a Book is written againſt Popery: but no man ſeeks to be informed. They will have it by all means to be eſteemed falſe, be it in it ſelf what it will or can be. And in that ſtrange prejudice men venture to die, onely

c nely for the pleaſure of a Miniſter and his V Vife and Children, who muſt needs have it ſo.

The occaſion of this his preſent book, intitled, *A Diſcourſe concerning the Idolatry*, &c. was, it ſeems, a queſtion or two propunded unto Mr. *Stillingfleet*, by I know not what Gentlewoman, who having heard the Doctor ſay, That *Proteſtants if they turned Roman Catholicks, would loſe their Salvation*; told him, That if Proteſtants ſay ſo, then are they full as uncharitable as Papiſts themſelves, who aver the like of Proteſtants: She therefore conſults ſome Catholick Gentleman in the buſineſs; I do not know whom neither. But he, it ſeems, put into her hand two queſtions, to ſhow to Doctor *Still.* in her next encounter. Firſt was, *Whether the ſame motives which ſecured one born and bred in the Catholick Church to continue in it, might not alſo ſerve to ſecure a Proteſtant, who convinced by thoſe motives ſhould embrace it.* The ſecond was, *Whether it ſuffice to be a Chriſtian in genere, or it be alſo neceſſary to adjoyn to ſome Church of Chriſtians in particular?* Theſe be the two queſtions.

The ſecond of theſe two queſtions the Doctor reſolves affirmatively; *I affirm*, ſaith he, *that a Chriſtian by vertue of his being ſo, is bound to joyn to the Communion of ſome Church*

or Congregation in particular. Thus he reſolves it, and ſpeaks not a word more of that buſineſs. Yet here we may take notice that the ſaid Reſolution of his, is quite contrary both to a book of his called *Irenicon*, written in the times of our late Anarchy, and alſo to his firſt work written more lately againſt Popery. For all the whole ſcope of both theſe books, is to ſhow that a Chriſtian by vertue of his being ſo, is not bound to joyn in the Communion of any one Church in particular, or any Organical Body, as he calls it. And that becauſe every ſuch body, either that is or has been in the world, is liable to errour, falſhood, and corruptions. And what neceſſity indeed can there be in me to joyn in any Communion, which may go aſtray and miſlead me, ſince I cannot do worſe if I remain free and all alone, and may perhaps do better? But theſe contradictions are ſmall matters. So long as the Doctor oppoſes the Catholick Church, out of which they are all fallen, he is a Proteſtant good enough, whatever he hold in particular, either contrary to himſelf or any others.

The firſt queſtion, which is the occaſion and ſubject of this his preſent book, he reſolves negatively; averring, *that the ſame motives which might ſecure one born and bred in the Catholick Church to continue in it, cannot ſecure*

a Proteſtant, convinced by them to imbrace it. And this his Aſſertion he diſcourſes at large, and confirms by various Syllogiſmes; becauſe invincible hinderance may perhaps excuſe the one, but not the other; becauſe the Proteſtant is ſafe in his own Church, and therefore has no neceſſity to leave it: becauſe there is imminent danger in the Roman Church; where there is ſo much *Idolatry*, ſo many hinderances of good life and devotion, ſo much diviſions, ſo much uncertainty of faith in it. Unto theſe reſolutions and argumentations of his, the Catholick Propoſer adjoyned preſently his own reply, a very rational me thinks and good one. Hereupon the Doctor wrote and ſet forth this his preſent book, called *A Diſcourſe againſt the Idolatry, &c.* both to inlarge his own arguments, and to diſable the Catholick Gentlemans Reply. And this was the occaſion, purpoſe, and ſubject of the book you put in my hand to peruſe, and write to you the ſubſtance of it with ſome few brief thoughts of my own upon it,

Indeed the whole book is a kind of Academick Act or Commencement: ſuch a one as we have once a year in our famous *Oxford & Cambridge*, written and printed for peoples delight and paſtime; and, if ſo it pleaſe the Stars, for his own honour and preferment by our Doctor. And it came forth very ſeaſonably

ably about a fortnight before the *Oxford* Act, to save the wits living here abouts, the great charges and some kind of pains of a Journey thither, being now furnished well enough aforehand with as subtile and good an Act, as that may haply be, at our own Doors, and which may please the women somewhat better, in our mother tongue.

The conclusions defended in this *Holborn* Act are these three. 1. *Popery is idolatrous.* And this is accomplished in two of his positions which he calls Chapters. 2. *Popery is a hinderance to a good life and devotion.* And this is dispatched at one other breathing, named his third Chapter. 3. *Popery is divided and disunited in it self.* And this puft out in his fifth Chapter, which concludes his book, And in midst of this great Act, rises up a prevaricating *Tripos*, to refresh our wearisomeness, and make a little sport. And he takes up the whole Scene of his fourth Chapter. And his Theme is, *Fanatiscime: the Church of* Romes *Fanatiscisme*; or the *Fanaticism of the Roman Church.* And upon my word, it has made many people merry, not the softer sex only, but the rougher and more serious mankind. And all do so clap and commend the man, that one may well believe he has received his reward; Idolatry, ill life and divisions of the Roman Church, which are his three less wild conclusions, we have in part already

ready heard of; even as we have heard talk of *Europe*, *Asia* and *Africa*. But *Fanaticiſme*, his merriment is, *I* think, the proper and peculair diſcovery of Dr. *Stillingfleet* himſelf: And he may deſerve either to give or take a ſirname from it; as *Scipio Africanus* took from *Africa*, and *Veſputius Americus* gave to *America* his new found Land. What is it, that wit and induſtry cannot bring to light, if they be joyntly bent both of them upon the ſearch? And a new diſcovery eſpecially of a rich pleaſant Country full of curioſities is ſo pleaſant to the Diſcoverer himſelf, ſo naturally pleaſant that *I* cannot but think that Doctor *Stillingfleet*, at his invention of *Fanaticiſme*, wherewith he hoped to make many others merry, laughed heartily himſelf.

He begins his Book with the Roman Idolatry: and he does wiſely in it. For Idolatry is ſuch a terrible thundering charge; that in all Readers judgments that Church is half condemned already, which hath that crime ſo much as laid upon it. Men therefore chooſe rather to be accounted Atheiſts than Idolaters. For the firſt argues wit, the other ſtupidity. Nor will one man of a hundred trouble himſelf to read over a book written on any purpoſe of clearing from that enormous crime either himſelf or religion profeſſed by the Author of it. Be the imputation never ſo falſe, yet is it ſtill a blaſting imputation; which kills and overthroms, not

ſo

so much by proving as by naming it. He must needs be impious who is an Idolater; and he must be an *I*dolater who is called so. Be it never so unjust, it is still a witty trick to cry out against him as an *I*dolater, whose honour and livelihood we would here in *England* undermine. Sad experience has proved this to be true too too often. And the Great God of Heavens anger lyes *I* fear heavily upon us for it. This thus far. Now forward,

IMAGE-IDOLATRY.

The Church of Rome worships God by Images, and is therefore guilty of Idolatry by giving to the Creature the worship due only to the Creator. For God having forbidden any such sort of worshiping him by his own law and commandments given by Moses, wherein he forbids his people to make any kind of image, pesel themunah, eikon glypton, sculptile, *any thing represented either by carving toole or pensil, cannot own that worship, nor can any such worship terminate upon God. And the reason of the law of Moses is unchangeable, which is that God's infinite and incomprehensible Deity cannot be represented. For which reason the wisest Heathen both particular men and Nations judged all such representations of the invisible*

G

Godhead to be incongruous and unbecoming his glory; And if this were inconsistent with Gods nature and will in the old Law much more in the new, where we are taught to worship God in spirit and truth, and to have no low unworthy thought of God. It might therefore seem more rational to worship God in the Sun and Moon which have more of God in them, and to say our prayers to the Sun and Moon then to any image or shadow; the same argument which excuses the one will justifie the other much more. For this reason St. Paul teaches that the Godhead is not like to gold or silver or stone, and blames those who change the glory of the incorruptible God into the image of corruptible man. And the Heathens in doing this did ill: although the wiser sort ameng them testifie that they did not hold their statues to be Gods, but that they worshipped God in them. And yet some antient Fathers disputed notwithstanding against that heathen practice and counted it idolatry. Wherefore Germanus Patriark of Constantinople sayes expresly that Christians make no representation of the invisible Deity; and Damascene that it is madness to go about it. Wherefore the Synode of Constantinople and that of Frankford pleaded hard against the making of any images amongst Christians howeyer the second Council of Nice vainly went about to defend them as innocent and useful helps. Finally,

Moses

Moſes himſelf explicates by his deeds the meaning of his own Law when he was ſo highly diſpleaſed with Aaron for the golden Calf he had made the people in his abſence. And yet Aaron did not make it to bring the people into heathen idolatry, but to give them only a Symbole of the Angel who was to go before the people: As alſo the two calves ſet up by Jeroboam in Dan and Bethel were ſet up only to keep the people from going up to Jeruſalem, and not to bring them to the idolatry of heathens. And therefore Primitive Chriſtians never uſed any images, as the learned of the Church of Rome acknowledge.

§ 1. This is the ſum of the Doctors Diſcourſe in this his firſt Chapter. And he cannot but expect his Reader ſhould have a mighty conceit of either his moſt high or moſt deep Divinity, who hath converſt ſo much with the learned ſort of the Church of *Rome*, the graver ſort of Philoſophers, and wiſer ſort of Heathens. Nothing does he here deliver, that was ſo much as thought of by the common ſort, the vulgar ſort, the ordinary ſort of Mankind. And O what pleaſure and content of heart will it be unto him, if he could meet with an adverſary of his *learned ſort* too, who viewing his airy ſubtilties ſhould oppoſe him ſeriouſly, as if he were ſerious himſelf; and then diſtinguiſh as if he were dealing with ſome ſolid

Divine

Divine; and then ply him with proofs and teſtimonies, refell him by ſhorter enthymems and longer ſyllogiſmes; ſubtilly ſearch in what Mood and figure he ſpeaks; and then tell him how his conſequence flaggs, or antecedent is ambiguous, till he have learendly conſumed a hundred pages in refutation of a trifle. Then ſurely will the Doctor be judged by all parties to be as he would be thought to be, an able man.

§ 2. The Catholick Church uſes indeed both in their publick and private oratories, ſome pious repreſentations of our holy Lord, either in his paſſion, or birth, reſurrection, or aſcention, or miraculous working of ſome divine miracle: And theſe holy figures of his are accompanied commonly with ſome others of his bleſſed Virgin Mother, the renowned Apoſtles, valorous Martyrs, holy Confeſſors, chaſt Virgins, or other happy followers of our Lord, who through many tribulations and a conſtant exerciſe of Chriſtian vertues have paſſed hence to a bleſſed life. All which do mightily avail, unto our retiredneſs and recollection; when we enter into the houſe of prayer, a holy place ſeparated and ſanctified for Gods ſervice, from our own houſes or the ſtreets. And the reſpect or eſteem we have for ſuch figures, is nothing but what we bear either unto the ſacred

cred histories recorded of the same persons, or to those good rules of life and promises of Gospel; which those Worthies have imbraced, for the incouragement and imitation of us, who are now strugling in that wicked world, which they overcame before us. For example, as we reverence the history of Christs incarnation, sounding in our ear; so do we look upon the figure of it represented to our eye: As we love the story of St. Mary Magdalens conversion; so do we like her picture. As we honour St. Pauls life and martyrdome; so do we respect his image. And St. Lawrences most cruel passion upon the hot burning Gridiron, when it is represented to us in a picture, we are in the self same manner affected towards it, as we are to the invincible vertue and patience there shown for the Love and honour of Jesus our Lord, whose steps he followed. So that, what authentick history records to us in words, of the vertue and valour of any of our Christian Ancestors; or what holy Gospel tells us, of the glory and crown to be rendred unto the good works of sobriety, charity, chastity, purity, patience, and the like: the same is without words painted unto us by these compendious hieroglyphicks, serving more speedily then words can do, to fasten us unto a strict recollection in our prayers

by

by one ſhort glance about us; and to a fear and awfulneſs of Gods preſence in that place where we are met together for his Service, accompanied with the figures of ſo many of our pious Anceſtours who are gone to Heaven before us; and alſo to a diſſipation of any worldly thoughts, that may, as they are apt enough to do, at that time come along with us there unto our hinderance. All this benefit we have by our Pictures, when we have haply no book to look upon, or know not by our ignorance to read, or cannot by darkneſs or other letttance attend unto that labour. And this is all the whole buſineſs of Images, as to Religion. In the Road of Philoſophy trodden by School-Divines, where thouſands of concluſions over and above faith are advanced and oppoſed by one another unto the ſharpning of their wits, many things are ſaid about every thing, as the creation, reſurrection, and the like, which faith in the ſame things is ſilent of; Nor are we in our defence of faith concerned at all in them. And it may be eaſily diſcerned by our Catholick practice. what uſe we make of our Images, when of a hundred people entring into a Church, not one of them ever caſts his eye wiſtly upon them, but contented with a general glance, compoſe themſelves preſently unto their prayers and meditations they keep ſilently in

 ſpirit

ſpirit towards God. And when our pictures are ſo ſullied and ſpoiled, that they will no more ſerve our uſe, we put them into the fire, as we would do alſo a page of ſacred Scriptures utterly obliterated and fouled.

§. 3. Indeed all the whole buſineſs of the uſe of Images at all, is but a matter of diſcipline and government, for the help of people in the great work of recollection and prayer; as is the uſe of Churches, and the muſick uſed in them, with the harp, viol, and other inſtruments, the uſe of beads and prayer-books. All which our Religion could ſpare, and yet be not at all impaired, as to any its eſſential or ſubſtantial parts. Nay there be inconveniences in any one of theſe things. Nor do I know any good thing in this world without ſome inconvenience or other. It is enough for us that the conveniences and benefits of any good we have or uſe, are more and greater than the inconveniences be. Many worthy Prelates in Chriſtianity have at times excepted very ſtrongly againſt Organs, as ſome hindrance of the great work of ſpiritual contemplation which Chriſtian people meet to practice together in their holy aſſemblies, the great paramount work of Chriſtianity, eſpecially at Maſs. But theſe men, although moved unto that their exception by a Zeal not evil, yet were they fain to yield at laſt unto

the

the prevailing reaſons of other Prelates which overbore their leſſer ones. Some other of our Catholick Doctors and Prelates would have had us to have uſed no pictures; that Jews and Pagans might not catch at that pretence to cavil againſt our Chriſtianity as they did. But all theſe ſubmitted at laſt, unto the prevailing part; by whom they were made to underſtand that the inconveniences they urged were but imaginary and ſmall, the conveniences great and real. There have been not a few who have excepted againſt much vocal prayer; becauſe it took up too much of the time which would be better employed in the more principal work of prayer in ſpirit. But yet could they not carry it, although their reaſons were very plauſible aad good; becauſe that high and Angelical prayer in ſpirit, agreed not equally to all men, or to any one conſiſting of fleſh and blood equally at all times and places, as vocal prayer does. Some have diſliked even our material Temples, built up ſo ſumptuouſly as they are; becauſe God immenſe and incomprehenſible, dwells not in buildings made by mans hands; Heaven is his Seat, and Earth his Footſtool; Yet could they not obtain, that our Churches ſhould be therefore puiled down, or not built up. Prayer-books were nothing at all in uſe amongſt Chriſtians in primitive times; when they pray-

ed almoſt altogether in ſpirit, and uſed no other vocal prayer but that our Lord taught us. And yet this hinders us not, either to make ſuch books or uſe them in following times.

Beads, ſtones. Inſtead of our beads in wood or mettal, they uſed in ancient times a bag of little ſtones, by the emptying whereof they knew that they had ſaid over our Lords prayer a hundred or perhaps three hundred times, according as any one in his devotion had prefixed to himſelf every day of his life to do for Gods glory and ſervice. And there might be inconveniences pretended againſt our preſent beads, eſpecially thoſe of gold and pearl. But they will not be thrown away for that. Our Church-muſick has been more than once oppoſed, and that by Prelates moſt holy and renowned men, who deemed it an unſufferable lettance to the ſpiritual recollection which Chriſtians ought above all things to attend unto, that they may have our Lords good Spirit, and his holy operations in them, eſpecially when they meet together at their holy Synaxis. But Church-muſick is kept up to this day, notwithſtanding their reaſon againſt it, which is very good, for other reaſons no leſs good and great than it; ſpecified and urged by the far greater number of pious Prelates for it. And yet if all or the greater part of Catholick Prelates meeting together

ſhou d

ſhould take away all theſe outward helps from us, beads and books, ſinging and Church-muſick, pictures, and Churches, and all, finding the inconveniences to be now greater than they have been, and weightier than any convenience we have by them: though the thing would ſeem very ſtrange to us, yet ought we I think to obey them reſignedly, and attend wholly unto our ſpiritual meditations, either alone, or in our Euchariſtian meetings, and to the other good works commanded or counſelled us in Goſpel in expectation of our future bliſs and eternal happineſs in God, which can never be taken from us: though all things of diſcipline or helps in government be alterable.

§ 4. And now it is time to turn back and view the ſubject of this Chapter; that we may ſee if any one period in it be true and pertinent. He tells us firſt, that Papiſts *worſhip God by Images*, which logically is not true; Then *that a repreſentation of the inviſible Deity cannot be made*; which is impertinent; Then *that the worſhip given to God by an image does not terminate upon God*: which is neither pertinent nor true. And ſo he proceeds on to the very end of his Chapter, with ſounds either empty or falſe, or both; neither heeding or caring what he ſays, ſo he do but mention learned papiſts, and wiſer heathens,

e which may help to butterreſs up his reputation. I cannot but remember here, the ſhadow or Ghoſt in Virgil which Juno made of Æneas, to draw her beloved Turnus out of the field; It ſeemed to fight and threaten, and preſs on and give back. But nothing at all was done really.

Tum dea nube cavâ tenuem ſine viribus umbram.
In faciem Æneæ, viſu mirabile monſtrum,
Dardaniis ornat telis, clypeumq; jubaſq;
Divini aſſimilat capitis, dat inania verba.
Dat ſine mente ſonum greſſuſq; effingit euntis
Morte obitâ quales fama eſt volitare figuras
Aut quæ ſopitos deludunt ſomnia ſenſûs.
Ac primas lata ante acies exultat imago
Irritatq; virum telis ac voce laceſſit.

And ſuch a ſhadow of controverſie is all this preſent Chapter, and his whole book alſo: a ſcoming face and feeble force: big but empty words: rumbling and yet inſignificant ſounds: quick profers, and no progreſs: a daring ſhadow or armed Ghoſt, without either body or bones. And yet ſuch a thing as defies the whole Catholick Church; ſteps out from the reſt of his Camp and defies them all alone; defies them both in letters ſyllables and words. And this is all. For he touches no body. Becauſe Catholicks by the advice and allowance

of

of their Prelates do keep amongſt them the repreſentation of the divine Founder of their Religion, who appeared amongſt us by his unſpeakable Love in form of a Man; and of ſome of his holy followers in the way he chalked out for us; therefore he talks of Moloch and Milcom, Oliris and Iſis, Chemoſh and Aſtaroth, Baal Peor and Rimmon, golden Bulls and Remphan, the calves of Dan and Bethel. And what is all this for? Wy to over-run Papiſts, and beat us down; How can it do that? Theſe idols were ſet up by heathens in oppoſition to the true God, and in the very place of God, as darkneſs in the night time is in the place of light. This is true, what then? and therefore I muſt not forſooth keep the figure of Jeſus Chriſt or of St. Paul or other domeſtick of my own religion for my own incouragement therein. What likeneſs, what conſequence is there in all this? Which is Remphan and where is Moloch? Which is the Calf and where is the Bull? Nay and here it is worth our obſerving too, that Proteſtant Gentlemen and Ladies of England, Miniſters and Biſhops too, have all pictures in their Chambers as well as Catholicks; even thoſe of our holy Apoſtles and Martyrs as well as others. And there they are good and lawful figures; but in our Chambers they are Bulls of Baſan, and Calves

of Bethel among us. Catholick pictures are againſt Moſes his Law; but theirs are not ſo; Although they be repreſentations both in Heaven above and Earth below, and Waters under earth, expreſly by the ſame Law forbidden; for example Moon and Stars, Dogs and Cats, Whales and Dolphins. The picture of Martin Luther in their Chamber is the lawful effigies of a man. But Saint Stephen in our Cloſet is a Calf. Can any man who talks at this rate, be thought to be one that has converſed either with the learned ſort of Papiſts or the wiſer ſort of Heathens: or one rather that had never any converſation at all either with reaſon or men. *O but Catholicks worſhip God by their images, which Proteſtants do not.* I marry, this is a huge fault indeed, that Catholicks take thereby occaſion to think of God and his manifold mercies, and bleſs his name, and truſt in him. For they no other way worſhip God by Images: This is the mortal ſin which Catholicks commit. And if that illogical ſpeech of the Doctor, *Catholicks worſhip God by Images*, be drawn into any kind of ſence, it can be no other than this, that Catholicks take occaſion by the pious faces of their Martyrs to think of Gods manifold graces and mercies towards them, and thereupon truſt in him afreſh, and bleſs his name: which great errour the Doctor, it ſeems,

ſeems, does careſully avoid. The ancient devout Chriſtians thought of God and worſhipped him by any thing, any good thing they enjoyed; the verdant fields and ſweet flowers, comfortable air, and pleaſing light, mountains, valleys and liquid ſtreams: Plumbs, Pears, Apples, and chearful Grapes; by the vertue, charity and devotion of men, the miniſtry of Angels, &c. But now we muſt take heed of that. We may taſte a Plumb or a Cherry, we may eat a veniſon Paſty and drink good wine if we can get it; nay we may have fine pictures in our Chambers, even the picture of Jeſus-Chriſt crucified, or any of his followers: we may have all this, if we be ſuch good Proteſtants as Mr. *Stillingfleet*, and never think of God, or *worſhip God* by it. But if we worſhip God by it, if we think of God by it, then it is all poiſon to us. All is ſuddenly turned to Moloch, to Remphan, to Baal Peor, to Aſhtaroth, to Aarons golden Steer and the Calves of Bethel. If we do but eat a cuſtard thinking of God, or *worſhipping God by it*, preſently it becomes a *Remphan* or Chiun, the idol of the Arabians. Walking upon Hamſtead-hill, as people uſe innocently enough to do, if caſting our eyes about the proſpect we think of God by it, as Catholicks are wont, the hill before innocent is now become a *Baal Peor* the idol of the Moabites. A Citizen walking

walking to the Tower, may look harmlesly enough upon the Crown and royal Robes there. But he must take heed then, that he fall not into a meditation of Heaven, or the glory of its great King, to worship him in his heart by it. For then it becomes to him an *Adramelech*, the idol of Sepharvaim. And he must beware of the like abuse when he sees the Chamber and Table where his Majesty sits in Council with his Peers, lest it become a *Moloch* to him, the idol of the Moabites. The very Flags and Banners often seen in London-streets, make some simple soul to think of Jerusalem above, the peace and happy company there, and the God of all; but then O how suddenly is the Streamer metamorphosed and turned into *Nesroch*, the idol of Senacherib. Some are so bold, when they either see or hear of any corrupted by the French-pox and lechery, to thank God who has preserved them, and *worship God by it*. And thereby sin no less grievously than Maacham the Mother of Asa King of Judah in worshipping her idol Priap or *Nimphleseth*. A gentleman called upon God not in words onely, but very heartily, when a troublesome Fly got into his Eye, and much afflicted him; but he little thought that by that piety of his he had sinned as deeply as they that worship *Baalzebub* the idol of Acaron. Nothing is more ordi-

nary

nary, with Country Gentlemen, when walking abroad they behold a goodly fair flock of sheep in pasture of their own, than to thank God and *worship God by it*; but little do they think good men, they are guilty of Idolatry thereby, as much guilty as they that worshipped *Ashtaroth*, the idol of the Philistins. Nay a very cow or calf in the meadows, if we take occasion by it to thank God for his benefits, or to *worship God by it*, is the same thing then, as Aarons *Moulten heifer* or Jeroboams *calves* set up in Dan and Bethel. And as it is for substance, so for the figures of things. St. Pauls picture so long as we do not think of God by it, is a lawful picture. But if we come once to think of God, to *worship God by it*, O then that is a Calf too, Aarons Calf, one of Jeroboams Calves, &c. This thinking of God, this worshipping of God by any thing, this is the pestilential blast, that spoils all. It turns sweet into bitter, lawful into unlawful, things innocent into sin, and good things to death. The representation of our blessed Lord crucified for us, so long as we think not of him may pass for a good innocent or at least indifferent thing; but if we once think seriously of him, if we worship God by it, then, O Mr. Stillingfleet, what is it then? And yet answer me not. For I will not have those blasphemous words here repeated.

Speak

Speak them to a Jew in order to Jesus Christ and he will embrace and love you. But a Christian cannot endure to hear them.

§ 5. *Papists* saith he *worship God by images, and so are guilty of idolatry*, Catholicks may hear this, but can never understand what he means. They are never taught in any of their Catechisms to worship God by Images. None of their spiritual books wherein all religious Duties are importunately urged and pressed upon them ever mention it: and their practice does not infer it. For if it did, they would easiliest understand it who best know what themselves do. They are taught, and do in their practice endeavour to worship God in their heart and soul, and ardent affections streaming forth thence towards him. They worship him with bended knees, lips and voice, hearts and eyes lifted up unto him. They worship him with the assistance of Gods good Spirit, the Priests Sacrifice, and help of mutual prayers. They worship him by mortifying their sensuality and carnal appetites, by giving alms and relieving the poor and needy for his Love, by observing his Laws and Counsels, by resigning to his good will and pleasure in all things, especially in time of afflicting persecutions, when they suffer all manner of reproach, lies and calumnies, loss of goods and sometimes life it self for his name

name ſake patiently. They worſhip him in Cloſets, in Church-aſſemblies, in the fields, as they are walking, on Land or Sea, where they have opportunity to do it. Thus doth their religion teach them to worſhip God, as with the right cauſes and inſtruments; as by the true effects and operations; as in the times and places ſeaſonable for worſhip and devotion. But how they ſhould *worſhip God by images*, or (as he ſpeaketh oftner in the context of his diſcourſe) *in images*; this they do not eaſily underſtand. When he lays any thing to Catholicks charge, he ought to ſpeak I ſhould think as Catholicks do, and then he will be underſtood by them. It is not to be conceived how any one can worſhip God *by images*, and *in images*, but either for the real preſence there; or ideal imitation; or ſome ſort of occaſion of worſhip ariſing thence. And ſo God muſt be worſhipped by them and in them, either preſentially, ideally, or occaſionally. And it cannot be preſentially. For ſo God is no otherwiſe preſent in a picture than in the wall it hangs upon: nor yet ideally; for the picture for example of St. Mary Magdalen or St. Paul, is no idea of that inviſible and glorious Godhead; nor yet is any other, as the Crucifix for example or Chriſt our Lord in his Birth or Reſurrection; for all theſe figures are repreſentations of his humanity, and

no

no idea's of his Deity at all. And Mr. Stillingfleet muſt needs mean one of theſe two ways. For otherwiſe he could not charge them with idolatry for it. And therefore I ſay that his charge is falſe and ſlanderous. But if he mean that they worſhip God by images and in their images, occaſionally; which is a moral interpretation and the only true one: Then is ſuch a work ſo far from Idolatry, that it is a ſublime piety. For what can they better do, then to give God thanks for ſo great graces, mercies, helps, and comforts beſtowed in Jeſus our Lord upon his Apoſtles, Martyrs, Confeſſors, and Virgins, when they look upon their figures and pictures either in their contemplations, or patience of Martyrdome, or converſion of the world, ſubduing and bringing fleſh, Satan and the world under their feet: eſpecially if Catholicks conceive thereby ſome pious reſolution, as well they may, of doing ſomething the more and patiently ſuffering for God, in imitation of thoſe pious Heroes our Predeceſſours in religion, and yet naturally but fleſh and blood as we our ſelves are. I ſay all this is ſignal piety, and our Chriſtian duty. And according to this morall meaning Catholicks if they do worſhip God by their images and in their images; do well and like good Chriſtians. But the Doctor will not charge them I ſuppoſe

poſe with a matter of ſo much truth and great piety as this is, although his words cannot make out any other ſence that is true, but only this morall one. And the more logical ſence of worſhipping God by images and in images; ideally or preſentially is falſe. Let him even take which ſence he pleaſes, either what juſtifies Catholicks or what falſifies his own aſſertion; It is all one to me, whether we ſtand, or he fall.

§ 6. He adds, *that the worſhip of God by images does not terminate upon God; becauſe God has forbid it and ſo gives Gods honour to the Creature.* This is ſtrange gibberiſh. An act that tends to nothing is no act. If it be ſome act, it tends and has already tended to ſomething; and it terminates upon that thing unto which it tends, and whoſe act it is denominated. This is clear enough even to a young ſophomore, or one who indeed never yet came into the aire of Philoſophy, if he do but underſtand the terms and words here uſed. For example I cannot ſee a man in the ſtreet, except my viſion terminate upon him; nor can my viſion terminate upon him, but *I* muſt ſee him. And it is all one whether I ſee him cloſe by me, or by my window or in a looking glaſs at home. For I cannot ſee him any way but my ſight muſt terminate upon him, and if it do not, I ſee him not. And this

this course of nature is not hindred, nor yet altered at all, because that person may haply have forbidden me to look upon him either this way or that. For our acts or actions are accomplished within our selves, independently of any acceptance or disacceptance of them. Acceptance or disacceptance, commanding or forbidding is another thing, extrinsecal and quite differing from the substance of the act or action. For they specifie onely, either the motive or event which may make the act either good or evil, either grateful or displeasing, but not make it an act or no act, or not to tend where it has tended. And so must my act of worshipping God by images, terminate upon God, or else it is no act of worshipping God by them; however God may have either commanded or forbid it. God has forbidden blasphemy; and yet the act terminates upon him, otherwise it could not be a sin against him. And if Gods worship by images do not terminate on God, whither on Gods name does it tend; and how is God worshiped by them? This he does not tell us here, unless he insinuate it in those following words of his, *but gives the honour due to God unto the Creature.* But how can that be? If God should have forbid us by his law to see a star through a tube; should we not therefore see it

but

but the tube only, or should not our sight then be terminated upon the Sar. So it seems by this Doctors philosophy, who hath conversed with the learneder sort of Papists, and the wiser sort of heathens, but very little with himself. Holy fathers and Doctors have often said, that the honour of an Image redounds to the Prototype: but never thought or said, that the honour of the Prototype redounds to the image, as it is here affirmed against both art and experience. But let us hear him proceed in his discourse. He will surely let fall some sence or truth ere long.

§ 7. *Gods infinite and incomprehensible Deity saith he, cannot be represented.* O here it is. This is very true. What a comfortable thing it is to meet with a draught of truth sometimes, when a man is dry and thirsts after it. But to what purpose is this spoken here? Catholicks have no representations of that invisible Deity, nor none they look after. Figures they have of our Lord Christ, born as man amongst us, and made flesh, and crucified, and ascending into Heaven. Figures also of his holy followers and Martyrs: but representations of the invisible Deity they never yet saw nor heard nor thought of. On then. *The wisest of heathens judged any such representations of the Divine nature incongruous and unbecoming his glory.* Indeed

they were wiſe heathens, and their judgment very right and good. Nor did I ever hear of any Chriſtian wiſe or unwiſe any otherwiſe minded: O how would this Doctor prevail, if this wiſe Diſcourſe of his, were as pertinent as it is true. But he truſts and hopes well, that his good fate will ſo accompany his reader, that he ſhall not doubt at all that every word that is true in his book is alſo to ſome purpoſe. And to ſome purpoſe indeed it is: namely to have it thought, that he is victorious in his maine deſign: although indeed and truth it belong nothing at all to it. But let me not ſtop his carreere. *If any ſuch figure of the Deity were inconſiſtent in the old Law, much more in the new where we are commanded to worſhip God in ſpirit and truth.* O uncontrouleable conſequence, ariſing from premiſſes moſt true. No man can or dare deny a l this. Me thinks I love him here for his reaſon, and cannot but grieve it ſhould be all ſpilt in vain; ſo pure it is and pretious. A little more of this, while he is in a good mood. *It ſeems more rational to worſhip God in the Sun and Moon which have more of God in them then a picture has, and to ſay our prayers to the Sun and Moon then to any Image.* Seems ſo Sir? It is certainly more rational: what ſhould we doubt of? And what a pitty is it, there ſhould be none to be found, who wor-

ſhip

ſhip God in a picture either ideally or preſentially; none who ſay their prayers to a picture that this great blow of his might not beat the aire to the indangering of his elbows. Saint *Paul teſtifies that the Godhead is not like either to gold or ſilver or ſtone.* Good St. Paul alwaies ſaid well; and his teſtimony is good at all times; and eſpecially now, when it hits ſo pat with the wiſer heathens. There be many Churches now in England which have ſince our reformation, the Tetragram name of God written upon the walls within ſide in golden letters. Unto thoſe men who did this, it would not ſeem altogether impertinent, to tell them, that *the Godhead is not like to gold, ſilver or ſtone.* But to ſuch as uſe only the effigies of our Lord according to his humanity, and his holy Apoſtles and Martyrs, what a pitty it is it ſhould be impertinent and wholly loſt. Let him ſpeak on ſome more of his truths. *Germanus Patriark of Conſtantinople ſaies expreſly that Chriſtians make no repreſentation of the inviſible Deity: and St. Damaſcene affirms it madneſs to go about it.* Marry, God have mercy o'their ſouls for this their expreſs ſaying. Catholicks would deſire no better a teſtimony for themſelves if they wanted any, then this of thoſe two great Catholick Doctors; that no ſuch repreſentation they have, and none they go

about to have. O but he hopes, that all this being true will make ſtrongly againſt the Church of Rome. And will it ſo? I have heard ſay, there be a thouſand Churches in Rome, which are all Churches of Rome equally. Which of them all are concerned in this talk, that their walls may confute him? But he means Catholick people perhaps. oh, O, then all is well, hey are ſafe enough and unhurt by all this, which is but their own doctrine, and faith. At leaſt he has by theſe fair ſhreds of truth farced up a dozen pages in his book; And he hopes that his proteſtant reader will believe it all to be moſt pertinent and appoſite diſcourſe againſt papiſhes, though it be nothing leſs. And if they do ſo think, he has his end, a happy man no doubt.

§ 8. *Moſes forbad* ſaith he, *the making of any graven thing, and the word which Moſes uſes in that his law for a graven thing is general and ſignifies not an idol only as papiſts ſay, but any picture, likeneſs, image or repreſentation, as Moſes himſelf ſpeaks, either in heaven above or in earth below or waters under the earth, peſel, themurah, eikon glypton, ſculptile, any kind of thing that may be expreſt either with the pencil or graving tool.* Believe me Sir if this be true it will undo all our Painters, who come flocking hither into England as the only thri-

ving

ving place for them out of Holland, Germany, France and Italy too; and here fill the Land with peſels, themunahs, eikons, glyptons, ſculptile's, and any things they can expreſs with their pencils for our delight; Dolphins, whales, and other fiſh of the ſea; birds of the Aire, beaſts, flowers, woods gallant men and fair women, all that ever Moſes forbad to be expreſt. Nay I have ſeen my ſelf in a proteſtant Church Moſes himſelf painted on the walls with glittering hornes on his head and a pair of law tables in his hand. But it may be Law-makers do exemp themſelves: at leaſt ſome Proteſtants may interpret as they ſeem to do, that Moſes forbad to make the figure of Jeſus Chriſt but not his own. No man in England ſcruples to have any of theſe eikons, no not the Doctor himſelf, notwithſtanding this law of Moſes ſo expreſly contrary to them all; no man doubts to ſet any painter or graver on work. And yet muſt ſtill this law be caſt in the teeth of Catholicks as tranſgreſſors of it. For Gods ſake why is St. Mary Magdalen in her penitential weeds upon her knees, with beads in her hand, and eyes all blubbered and ſwoln with tears, more againſt the law of Moſes; than one of our delicate Paragons of beauty, in her ſhining dreſs, lips of coral and ſparkling eyes. *O but Catholicks worſhip them.* Sir

this word in the ſence and meaning of proteſtants is as great a falſhood as was ever uttered by man. For Catholicks neither have nor can have any other relative eſteem of any picture, than what they have to the penitential works they repreſent, or to the worth and piety of the perſons. And an abſolute eſteem of the picture, this is meaſured out only by the Materials, and artifice of the painter; according to which one picture ſhall be worth five hundred pounds, and another repreſenting the ſame thing, not worth five ſhillings. And can we believe that our proteſtant young Gentlemen have no veneration at all to our beauties ſet thus in their Majeſty, nor no kind of affections riſing in their hearts towards them? Yea ten to one more of ill affections, and, god wot greater, then any good ones we can have to our crucified Jeſus in our way of piety. And the difference indeed is only this, that our reverence and affection is towards holy perſons, and unto an imitation of their piety, hope, patience, conſtancy, and charity: Their's to a concupiſcence of fleſh and eyes. This and nothing but this if truth may be ſpoken, makes them ſo wrathful and furious againſt our Catholick pictures. Satan hates Jeſus Chriſt and therefore inflames them to tear down his memories and repreſentations: but he loves pride of life; and thoſe portractures

muſt ſtand that advance this. He is pleaſed with that which feeds concupiſcence of eyes: and concupiſcence of fleſh brings him in the diſciples which Jeſus Chriſt loſes.

Moſes did forbid Jews who were travelling with him towards Paleſtine an idolatrous Nation, to make to *themſelves*, that is to ſay on their own heads, without warrant of the Synagogue, or in imitation of the pagan rites, any of the idolatrous images there and elſewhere to be met withal, or any ſimilitude at all, leaſt ſeduced thereby, they leave their own God and religion to cleave unto falſe gods and idolatry. This law of Moſes and purpoſe of the law is ſo clear, that he muſt be obſtinately blind who ſees it not. And what does this concern our holy Catholick figures of St. Paul for example or Chriſt crucified, more than Proteſtant figures of young Lords and fine Ladies; ſave that the one moves us to the love of mortification, prayer, patience, chaſtity, the other allures us from it; the one confirms Religion, the other weakens it. Beſides our holy pictures are allowed by the Church, the others forbidden. And this indeed is the onely aim of Moſes, when he forbids the people to make to *themſelves* any graven images whatſoever; to *themſelves*, that is on their own fancies and upon their own authority: For ſuch onely were unlawful, and

not thoſe they were commanded by juſt authority and allowed to make. See, ſaith God by Moſes, I have called and named Beſaleel, and I have filled h m with the ſpirit of wiſdom and underſtanding and all knowledge of all manner of workmanſhip, to deviſe cunning works to work in gold and ſilver and braſs, and in cutting of ſtones and in graving of wood, to work all manner of workmanſhip. And I have appointed Aholiab with him; and in the hearts of all the wiſe I have put wiſdom, that they make all that I have commanded. And by virtue whereof the ſaid men and others after them wove and graved pomgranets and lilies, and placed Cherubs upon the Propitiatory, between which graven Cherubims God himſelf gave out his Oracles to Moſes: as he did alſo heal the people by the figure of a Serpent which Moſes commanded to be ſet up. So that here is a vaſt difference betwixt figures graven and ſet up by authority, and thoſe which people make to themſelves. The one is commanded, the other forbidden. Aarons Calf of gold deſtroyed the people, but Moſes his Serpent of braſs healed them. Theſe things are not now ſaid afreſh. They have been told to Miniſters over and again, but they are never the better for it. Indeed they love not to hear of it, becauſe itſpoils their ſport.

I add yet withal, over and above what is yet ſaid, that neither that law of Moſes, nor any of his Ten Commandments, nor any other of his precepts either ceremonial judicial or moral, does any way oblige Chriſtians at all, as it comes from Moſes, who is not our Law-maker or maſter, but ruler and leader of the Jews. Nor do we Chriſtians believe that theft, adultery, homicide or blaſphemy, is a ſin becauſe Moſes forbad it, but becauſe we have receiv'd from Jeſus our own Legiſlator who juſtified Moſes law and ratified it in all the ſaid particulars, that ſo it is. And it is here to be ob'erved that one of the moſt ſolemn laws contained in thoſe two tables, that I mean, which ordains the ſeventh day to be kept holy day, unto which Moſes adjoyns an irrefragable and unchangeable reaſon, namely becauſe God reſted that day when he made this viſible world, beginning his work ſaith Moſes on the ſunday wherein he created light, and the friday following finiſhing the whole; even this law of his moſt ſolemn and importunely urged by Moſes, is annulled and abrogated amongſt all Chriſtians even from the beginning of Chriſtianity, for want of rat fication of it from our Lord and Maſter Jeſus who is our Law-maker and Prince. And the ſame thing do I ſay of this his preſent law about figures, images and repreſentations of

things

things by ſculpture or pencil, which was only of temporal concernment to the then preſent Jews againſt the danger of idols which then filled the earth, and as meer a ceremonial law as the other, and equally concerning a ceremony of worſhip. If our own Prelates whom Chriſt our Lord inſtituted to overſee his flock ſhould for reaſons beſt known to themſelves take from us thoſe little ſmall helps we have by the images of ſome of our Anceſtors, Martyrs, Apoſtles, Virgins, Confeſſors, then would we be without them, and yet not think our ſelves to loſe one jot of our Religion for that. But we will not forfeit them for any law made by Moſes, except it be eſtabliſhed and ratified by our own Law-maker or his Prelates watching over us under our Lord unto our good, if Moſes ſhould have made any law againſt them, which indeed he did not, but onely againſt heathen Idols. And if any one ſhould endeavour to have our Chriſtian repreſentations to be aboliſhed becauſe he thinks and believes that Moſes forbad them, then is that man ſay I, bound to obſerve all the whole Law of Moſes, as it is literally expreſſed by him, even to the leaſt apex or iota thereof. For the authority of a Legiſlator being the ſame in all his whole law, muſt oblige equally in all its parts: and the diſtinction then between judicial, moral, and ceremonial law, ſignifies

nifies nothing; seeing that Moses his commands are equally peremptory, and press as strongly in the one as in the other. This is no imaginary opinion of mine own, but what reason and the Spirit of God moved St. Paul to aver as stoutly in the case of circumcision, which is another of Moses Laws, as I do here. *I* testifie to every man, saith he, who is circumcised, that he is bound to keep the whole law. And this must needs be true, most certainly true: for by observing circumcision because it was commanded by Moses, he subjects himself to the law and authority of Moses as his Prince and Legislator; and consequently is bound to observe him equally in all things which he commands with the same authority and will to be obeyed, which is no less then all his whole law. And cursed is every one, saith the same Apostle, who is under the law and continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to fulfil them. Although then it should be granted that Moses by his law prohibited all kind of figures and representations, even those used by Christians, which he did not, yet if our Lord ratified it not, it does not touch us at all. And that he did not renew or ratifie it, is sufficiently clear to Protestants, because no such law of his is found among the Evangelists: and unto Catholicks no less, because there

there is neither Gospel nor Tradition for it. And if all men would separate themselves from prejudice, which blinds and hardens them in their conceits, they might easily believe that neither Christs immediate Disciples nor any Christians that succeeded them after our Lords departure, would have either feared or hated the figure of our Lords countenance, if by chance they would have met with it. But if any one notwithstanding, fully perswaded that Moses made a law against all sort of images and representations, should upon that authority of his abolish ours, he is bound also upon the same authority to sacrifice an Ox, and observe all the whole law in all and every particular, under the penalty of sin.

Since therefore by the order of God and Moses many graven things were made; representations and similitudes both in Heaven and Earth notwithstanding the said law; as the Serpent of brass (which must either be made by melting or graving) pomegranates, lilies and various such-like things both graven in stone and interwoven in silks, Cherubins or Angels in the Propitiatory, even in Moses time and afterwards more fully and plentifully in *Solomon's* Temple; it is not rationally to be doubted, but that this law of his was intended onely to keep those people close and constant

to

to their own God and to their own Religion, which was inconsistent with the idols of the Nations; and not for any purpose of keeping Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, either out of their chamber hangings or ours. I know the Jews do urge this Precept of Moses very eagerly against Christians ever since Jesus Christ our Lord was rejected by them, whose image and figure they cannot abide to see. But we must have patience with all men.

§ 9. *Moses* saith he, *grounded this law of his upon a reason unchangable, namely that Gods infinite and incomprehensible Deity cannot be represented.* O profound invention! This is such a law and ground of a law, as was never before thought of. The ground and reason of making a law must be this, an impossibility of breaking it. They must not make any representations of God, because God cannot be represented. And the same motive or reason will be equally proper for all the rest of the Commandments: *They must keep the seventh day of the week a holy day.* The reason and motive; because there is not an eighth day to keep holy and sanctifie. *They must honour their Parents.* The ground and reason of this; because none of the whole Camp had any Fathers or Mothers alive to dishonour. *They must not kill.* The motive and reason is; because they were all shot-free, and so firmly

inchanted

inchanted that none could hurt them. *They must not commit adultery.* The ground and reason is; because there was never a woman in the camp, which any man though provok'd with the highestlust could possibly come near or touch with a pair of tongues. *They must not steal.* The great cause thereof is, that there is nothing at all in the Camp for any man to take away. Thus the Doctor imagines Moses to forbid any representations of God because God cannot be represented. And such another discreet Mounsieur was he who solemnly commanded his bowyer not to make him any shafts at all of a piggs taile: and he gravely gave him the reason for it, because quoth he of a piggs tail no shaft can be made. Truth is, Moses never thought of any such law, nor any such reason of it much less; but provided for the security of the Hebrews religion, that it might remain unchangable and firm in the mids of those many Nations round about them who worshiped false Gods and idols: as Moses very frequently interprets himself and all the Prophets after him. Therefore saith God by Moses, thou shalt have no other Gods but me, thou shalt not make to thy self any figures, as the Gentills do, nor worship them. For I am a jealous God and will have no intermingling of devillish idolatry with my service

ſervice; And all the reaſon given by Moſes is gods jealouſie not induring any divine worſhip but his own. This is the very truth and all the truth of this buſineſs, which this Doctor would turn another way, thereby to make Moſes ſeem as ſimple a man as himſelf. And thoſe idols forbidden by Moſes did ſo involve an oppoſition to the true God and his divine worſhip, that people could not poſſibly betake themſelves to one, but they muſt leave the other. Therefore did Moſes forbid both other Gods beſides their own one God, and all idols together: which was by antient Chriſtians very rationally and wiſely reckoned all one and the ſame commandement: whereof no leſs a man, then St. Auſtin himſelf is witneſs. But the memories of Abraham Iſaac and Jacob could bring no ſuch danger with them. And that is our care, for we are not in danger of looſing the faith of Jeſus Chriſt by keeping the image of him our crucified Lord among us; or forſaking the communion of Saints, by retaining their portraictures before our eyes. We ſhould *ipſo facto* renounce our Lord and all his whole Religion, ſhould we ſet up Moſes his forbidden idols and make it our religion to worſhip them as heathens did. But we are heartened incouraged and confirmed in our Chriſtian Religion by looking

on the faces of ſo many our glorious Martyrs, holy Anchorets, and Hermits, pious Virgins and Confeſſours, who profeſt this our Religion before us, bravely triumphing by the power of Chriſts love and divine faith, over ſins allurements, and deaths uglieſt terrours; though incompaſſed themſelves with the like paſſions and infirmities we are our ſelves invironed round about. And when we are entred into a Church amongſt ſo many of our worthy predeceſſors, we compoſe our ſelves more heartily to our devotion then otherwiſe we ſhould do, in imitation of them; remembring now that we are come up to Mount Sion, to the City of our living God, to celeſtial Jeruſalem, and ſociety of Angels, to the Church of Primitive Chriſtians conſcript in the Heavens, to God the Judge of all, to the Spirits of juſt men pertected, to Jeſus the mediator of a new Teſtament, and to the aſperſion of blood ſpeaking better things then Abel.

§ 10. *The Heathens*, ſaith he *did ill in their idoll worſhip, and yet the wiſer ſort among them teſtifie that they did not hold them to be Gods but worſhiped God in them.* Our acute divine having now by his fine wit ſo clarified Moſes law, that it might not ſo much concern Idolaters as our vulgar painters; he now begins ſo to purifie idolaters practice too

to, that they may ſeem but in the ſame condition with our Catholick and beſt Chriſtians. And who would not give his penny to hear him act and ſpeak. The heathens all in general are ſo excuſed in their idolatry, Aaron in his act of apoſtacy, and Jeroboam in his great ſin; that they are all and each of them no otherwiſe faulty then the Church of Rome in his books. Thus doth Mr. Stillingfleet convert idolatrous Nations, while he ſits dreaming in his cloſet. Here he diminiſhes and there he exaggerates, here he blacks with his pen and there he whitens, and then he cryes out all is one, all of the ſame meaſure, all of the ſame colour. And truly I believe the great Gyant Goliah and little David might thus be made equal, if the Gyant were beheaded and cut off by the knees, on one ſide; and David on the other ſide, ſet upon a high pair of ſtilts. While Catholicks are made to do what they do not, and heathens not to do what they do, on a ſuppoſal that all this is true, there can be no great difference Let us then hear him what he tells us of Heathens in general. *The wiſer ſort among them, teſtifie* quoth he, *that they worſhiped not the idols as gods but worſhiped God in them.* O very good? Thus the wiſer ſort among the heathens ſay. But firſt who are theſe wiſer ſort? It behooved him to let

us know this. But yet for his own pocket-reasons he does not. But 2ly what says he himself to it? O that is needless: for his reader will understand well enough what he ought to think, when such a Doctor as Stillingfleet tells him what the wiser sort have thought. No body would think with fools, but with the wiser sort alwayes. And his whole discourse proceeds on this supposed knowledge of the wiser sort and according to it concludes. We cannot therefore doubt of his mind. But have we no wise sort of antient beleevers who lived among the heathens, to testifie unto us what the heathens did? Have we no Apostles and Prophets to hearken to, no renowned and infallible persons to inform us? Surely we have, and those so many, that we need not have recourse either unto persons unknown amongst the heathens for their testimony, or to Mr. Sillingfleet the ingenious trifler. He tells us *that the heathens did not worship their Idols as Gods, but worshiped God in them.* But our Apostles and Prophets tell us contrary things. Hear Moses speak, who lived among the thickest of the Heathens, To whom did they sacrifice, O Moses, whom did the heathens worship? *Immolaverunt Demoniis & non Deo, Deut.* 32. They worshiped not God but devils, they sacrificed to devils saith he, and not to God. The Nations change their gods, and indeed

indeed they are no Gods, ſaith Jeremy ch. 2. but my people have changed their glory unto an Idol. Baruch another Prophet brings in his teſtimony chap. 4. You have provoked him who made you, ſaith he, even the eternal God, ſacrificing to Devils and not to God. The holy Pſalmiſt he tells us no leſs peremptorily, That they immolated their Sons and Daughters to Devils, and ſacrificed to the idols of Canaan, Pſ. 105. and that all the gods of the Heathens are Devils, Pſ. 95. Saint Paul our own Chriſtian Doctor is bold, and expreſly, teſtifies both againſt Stillingfleet and his wiſer heathens; That the things which Gentiles immolated they ſacrificed to Devils and not to God, 1 Cor. 10. And yet after all this our Doctor is not aſhamed to juſtifie thoſe his clyents the heathens. *They did not worſhip their idolls* ſaith he, *for Gods, but worſhiped God in them.* And whom ſhall we here believe? Moſes, Jeremy, Baruch, David, St. Paul and all our Chriſtian Doctors, or Stillingfleet rather and his wiſer heathens unknown to himſelf? They ſacrificed to devils and not to God; they changed their glory into an Idol: they irritated the eternal God, immolating to devils and not to God; they ſacrificed their ſons and daughters to devils, not to God. Thus ſpeak our Prophets and Apoſtles. But Mr. Sillingfleet affirms, they ſacrificed to

God, they imolated to God, they worſhiped God and not devils, they worſhiped not the idols but God in them. But I diſcern well enough the cauſe of his miſtake. Becauſe they abſtracted the general notion of God, and applied it, each one to his own idols; therefore he thinks he may ſay they worſhiped God in them. But this is a groſs miſtake. For to worſhip God in a thing and to worſhip a thing for God who is no God, are two very differing caſes. Chriſtians worſhip God in Chriſt, and they do well; heathens who worſhiped their Idols for God did ill. Cromwell our late Uſurper after he had murdered our good King and ſet the Crown upon his own head, would have taken it well, if his Army had told him they honoured him for their King; but not, if they had ſaid they worſhipped the King in him. The firſt word had ſounded in his ears as a grateful flattery, the other as treaſon to himſelf. To abſtract the Deity and apply it to another ſubject unto whom it does not belong, is as far as we are able to behead the true God and ſet his Crown upon the ſhoulders of uſurping devils. And becauſe the true real Deity cannot be removed, either by the pleaſure of the Uſurper or worſhiper, therefore are theſe idols devils and falſe Gods. God cannot be worſhiped in them becauſe he is not in them; and if they

be

be worſhiped as Gods it is Idolatry; or elſe there is no ſuch thing as idolatry upon earth

Aaron, ſaith he, *made the golden calf, not to reduce the people unto heathen idolatry, but for an embleme of the good Angel who was to go before them.* Here is another excuſe of Aaron his ſmall fault; which drove Moſes his brother and Prince into a great a paſſion of wrath as perhaps he ever felt: even ſo prevalent a grief and anger, that it daſhed in pieces the very tables of the Law he had in his hands; though he was by the teſtimony of holy writ the mildeſt of men: and all this it ſeems for an embleme: And why that emblem? ſince they had ſuch an emblem before in the pillar of cloud by day and fire by night; which was a more ſignificant emblem of the angel who went before them, then any calf of gold could be. The holy Prophets teſtifie of thoſe people and Aaron, that in Moſes abſence this figure was melted and founded by them to be ſet up in place of the God, who had hitherto conducted them with Moſes now as they thought vaniſhed, out of Egypt into Arabia; and to lead them on the reſt of their way, as their ſupream conduct after the manner of Egyptian Deities. They made a calf in Horeb and adored the figure, they changed their glory into the

likeneſs of a Calf eating hay and forgot their God, Pſal. 125. Now if they forgat their own God, and ſlighted him, and caſt him from them, and changed his glory into a calf, and worſhiped the very figure: then muſt that ſculptil or ſtatue be now accepted for their God. The like teſtimony gives St. Sephen, Act. 7. They made ſaith he, a calf in thoſe dayes and offered ſacrifice unto the Idol, and made themſelves merry in the works of their own hands. What can this import, but that they had now altered their religion, renounced their former God, and made to themſelves a new one after the manner of Egypt. It is pitty Mr. Stillingfleet had not been with Aaron; his confidence would have pleaded for him a little more handſomly then he did for himſelf. But the excuſe perhaps being hypocritical and falſe would have more offended Moſes, then his former fault. Aaron knew well enough what he had done. And although he ſomewhat minced his fault, yet would he not tell a lye. I caſt a little mettal into the fire, ſaith he to Moſes, and there came out this calf, The Doctor adds two pretty reaſons, why neither he nor the people, could ever think of declining then to any heathen idolatry, Firſt *becauſe they had no pretence of doing ſo.* As though the very abſence of Moſes, whom they had long expected and

now

now thought loſt, were not pretence enough, unto ſome leading men in the Camp to raiſe a ſedition and thereby force Aaron to make them ſuch idols, as they were acquainted with in Egypt. It is well enough known, that by the contagion of thoſe leading men, the Camp was ever and anon in ſuch like tumult and ready diſpoſition to apoſtacy. His ſecond reaſon is, *becauſe no intimation is made that they fell into heathen idolatry*. What intimation is given thereof by the Prophet and St. Stephen he takes it ſeems for no intimation at all. *When they fell*, ſaith he, *into heathen idolatry, mention is made of their Gods, as Baal Peor, Moloch, Remphan; but here Aaron is ſaid to make a feaſt to the Lord*: As though there were not Egyptian idols as well as Syrian; and Oſiris and Iſis, as well as Moloch and Remphan. And a feaſt made in honour of this their new God and religion, might well be ſaid *a feaſt to the Lord*. It was a policy in Aaron, thus to ſpeak, that the common people might not ſuddainly diſcern the alteration. And we may eaſily believe that the leading men, who brought him by perſwaſion and force unto this apoſtacy, ſuggeſted the ſaid ſtratagem; firſt to get the people more univerſally on their ſide without commotion: and then to put ſomething into their mouths for to ſay to Moſes, if he ſhould

chance

chance to come upon them ſuddainly, and take them beyond expectation in the fact. For that it was a meer pretence of policy is evident by this; that they gave to Moſes no ſuch account of any feaſt made unto their antient true God; and ſecondly becauſe their principal Leaders had no purpoſe to make any, for they had now forgot and put away their own true God and caſt him out of their mind, as holy text ſpeaks, *obliti ſunt Dei ſui.*

The Calves ſet up by Jeroboam in Dan and Bethel, were only to keep the people from going up to Jeruſalem and not to bring them to any idolatry of the heathens. Here is another excuſe for Jeroboam and his peccadillo. Who would not take Mr. Stillingfleet to be a very charitable man, who can cover ſuch a multitude of ſins? and yet is it all no other but a ſecret prodigious malice againſt Catholicks, who muſt bear the more and hear the worſe for it. *Jeroboam* ſaith he *did not alter the divine worſhip, or give any occaſion of idolatry*: No, no. He only kept the people, ſaith he from going up to Jeruſalem, whither they uſed once a year to reſort. And this could be no ſuch great matter; ſince they had the ſame ſervice, the ſame ſacrifice and adoration at home. But why then is Jeroboam charged with idolatry in holy Scripture, as one that had done evil above all that went before

him

him, and made him other gods and molten images to provoke God to anger, and to cast his own God behind his back, 1 Reg. 14 *O, ho, thence we conclude* saith our Doctor *that an image set up for gods honour is idolatry; as it is amongst papists.* And is not this a pretty nimble leigerdemaine of a slight man. First who taught him that *Papists set up images for Gods honour? I* have learned amongst them that they are set up for our incouragement and imitation, and for an honourable memory of their holy Martyrs and Apostles. But what horour can one of those images be to God? none at all I think, except indirectly, because God is the blessed author of all good, whence the said Apostles & Martyrs received their strength and grace. Secondly where does this confident man find, that *Jeroboam set up his images for Gods honour? Even no where at all.* His own boldness is so strong in him, that he sayes what he lists without any ground or occasion at all any where, either among sacred writers or prophane. Thirdly whence doth he gather his negative word, *that Jeroboam acted none of the heathen idolatry, nor brought the people to it?* Even from his own confident brain whence he hes the other, expressly contrary to the testimony of holy writ which speaks, as it were passionatly and very emphatically of his notorious idolatry, wherein he

did

did evil above all that were before him, wherein he made him other gods and molten images, to provoke God to anger, and caſt his own God behind his back. Can he be juſtly charged with all this, only becauſe he kept the Iſraelites from going up to Jeruſalem, and made them do thoſe devotions at home which they were wont to do in that mother Citty. Can only change of place ſuffice for the criminous imputation of idolatry, where is the ſame adoration, ſame rites, ſame ſacrifice, ſame Prieſts, and ſame God. Is it poſſible that the ſame ſervice and Common-prayer-book read by Miniſters of the ſame kind in London and Highgate, be Gods ſervice in one place, and idolatry in the other, all other things agreing but only the circumſtance of place? No indeed, it is not poſſible it ſhould be ſo. But it is very poſſible it ſhould be ſaid ſo. Mr. Stillingfleet here ſpeaks it, and ſpeaks it ſtoutly, on his own head, even againſt all Divine authority and upright reaſon. People may ſin againſt eccleſiaſtical obedience indeed, by not coming up to their parochial Church when they are commanded. But they cannot, only upon that ground, be charged with idolatry, or making ſtrange gods, or caſting their own God behind their back. He muſt be a very paſſionate Prelate, and extreamly unjuſt and ſinfully injurious

jurious, who laies that imputation upon people, upon no other ground or motive then that one circumstantial neglect of place. And yet holy Scripture several times thus charges Jeroboam; and puts such a blot upon his scutcheon both for his own idolatry, and that into which he induced all the people, that he is seldom or never mentioned without his black sirname; *Jeroboam who made Israel to sin.* If it were true at least, as Mr. Stillingfleet here speaks, that Jeroboam and Israels sin were only a circumstance of place, and that they and he did in their own tribes but what was done in Jerusalem, then must it needs follow, that there were in the Temple of Jerusalem such like representations, as those calves set up by Jeroboam in Dan and Bethel, and indeed the very same with them. And thence we may gather for our learning, if this be all true, an axiom of great truth and concernment; namely, that one and the same piece of worship which pleases God in the Catholick Church, is an abomination to him in the waies of heresie and schisme. The very same thing which in Jerusalem and the tribe of Judah were called Cherubims; in Samaria and all the rest of Israel apostatised from them, was but a calf.

§ 11. *Charles the great a noble Emperour caused Books to be set forth against the Council of Nice where images had been established, called Carolin Books, and assembled also a Council at Frankford wherein both the said Nicen Council was condemned, and all their reasons for images confuted,* &c. That there were both in the Councill of Frankford and Nice too, some Catholick Prelates who propounded difficulties against images cannot be denied. For whenever any Councill meets together about any affair, they dispute *pro* and *con*, both for and against it; that the Prelates having all things set before their Eyes that can be said on both sides, might be the better inabled to determine. So doubtless it was done by the Apostles themselves in their great Councill held in Jerusalem about Circumcision, where *inquisitio magna facta est*, great inquisition, disputation, and examination was made about it. All this is certain enough. But yet, that either in Frankford or any where else, were made after this their dispute any final or conclusive declaration against the use of images amongst Christians; or that Charles the Emperour should either write books or cause any to be written, either against images or the Council of Nice where in they had been then established; or summon that Council of Frankford to withstand that

that other of Nice unanimously concluded by the Prelates and confirmed by the general Pastour; this is a thing so apparently false and fictitious, that there needs no more but the knowledge of those very persons and times to prove it so. Charles the Great was one that adored the Roman Church whereof he was himself a Member, above all Emperours that ever was before or since his time. The Council of Frankford, wherein were little less then three hundred Catholick Prelates, was peaceably concluded, and no commotion followed upon it; which must needs have risen, if they had condemned another Council lately celebrated and confirmed by all pastoral authority. Nor was that Frankford Councill ever annulled or any way censured either by P. Adrian or any after him. Add to this, that the said Councill was both begun and finished under the same Pope Adrian, and his Legates Theophilact and Stephanus, who had presided lately in the said Nicen Council, where the lawful use of images was established. It cannot possibly be imagined that the same Pope and Presidents should conclude in Frankford quite contrary to what they ordered in Nice but seven or eight years before. It is also certain, that the said Council of Frankford, was summoned and assembled, not about images only as

the

the Doctor imagines, but about the queſtion of our Lord Chriſt his filiation, as all antient hiſtories teſtifie, againſt Fœlix and Elipand two Spaniſh Biſhops, and Claudius Taurinenſis, who teaching that our Lord is rather to be called an adoptive than natural Son of God, raiſed much commotion in Spain and France: aud this novelty of theirs was firſt condemned at Ratisbone, and afterwards at Frankford. For Fœlix after his firſt condemnation, repaired to the Emperour Charles his Court who then wintered at Rheginum; and there ſubmitting to the Prelates, was ſent thence to the preſence of Pope Adrian, where in the Cathedral of St. Peter he revok'd his Errour. Elipand hearing of his ſubmiſſion grew more violent, and by his books both regained Fœlix again, and diſturbed all Germany, as he had France and Spain before. And now to prevent the infection, the Pope and Charles the Emperour agreed to bring together a conciliar Aſſembly of Prelates in Frankford, wherein preſided Theophylact and Stephanus, who had lately concluded the ſecond Council of Nice. Whence it clearly appears that Doctor Stillingfleet quite miſtakes the buſineſs. Now if the ſame Pope and his very ſelf-ſame Legates preſided firſt in the Nicen Council, and then in Frankford, as the Doctor acknowledges, we may rationally enough

enough conclude, that the Nicen decrees about images, lately finiſhed in the Eaſt, were made known to the Weſt by their acceptation and promulgation at Frankford, where the buſineſs of filiation was decided: For this is indeed very true. But no way can we think that the ſame Preſidents would now undo, what they had done a little before, And that this is indeed the whole truth in this buſineſs, may be yet confirmed by the authority of the Council of Senon kept not long after, which in their 14. decree thus ſpeaks, *Carolus magnus Francorum Rex Chriſtianiſſimus in Francorum-furdenſi conventu ejuſdem erroris iconomachorum ſuppreſſit inſaniam quam infeliciſſimus quidam Felix in Gallias & Germanias invexerit.* By this teſtimony it appears, that Felix over and above his capital errour about Chriſt our Lords adoption, was an iconomachus too or adverſary of images, and ſuffered at Frankford for both his errours: which is not unlikely by the teſtimony of Platina and Paulus Emilius: For Platina in the life of Pope Adrian, *Biennio poſt*, ſaith he, *Theophylactus & Stephanus Epiſcopi inſignes Adriani nomine, Francorum & Germanorum Synodum habuerunt, in qua & Synodus quam ſeptimam Graci appellabant, & hæreſis Felíciana de tollendis imaginibus abrogata eſt.* And P. Emilius

in

in his second book *de gestis Francorum* speaking of that Councill of Frankford, *Et imaginibus*, saith he *suus honor restitutus est*. The like may be proved out of Blondus, Sabellicus and other historians. So that all these things rightly considered and put together, will sufficiently convince his relation of the Frankford Councill to be fictitious and groundless. If the Councill were assembled by the Agreement of the Pope and Emperour, then not of the Emperour against the Pope. If to suppress Elipand, Claudius, and Felix; then not the Nicen Prelates. If under the same Pope and Presidents which presided lately in Nice, then not against any thing determined and concluded in Nice. If upon the motive of Elipands errour against our Lords filiation; then was not an image the principal occasion of it. If Felix were there condemned for his opposition to images then were not images condemned. If Charles the great, one of the devoutest to the Roman Church that ever raigned, so much swaied in that Councill, then would he not suffer the Roman Church to be there affronted and censured. If an upright Catholick, he would not in spirituall affairs gainsay the Prince of Prelates, who had so lately set his hand and seale to Nicen definitions. In a word if Charles the Great called that

Councill

Council at Frankford, as the Doctor affirms, then without all doubt was that ratified there, which was eſtabliſhed at Nice a little before. For Charles was as much a Roman Catholick as either Stephen and Theophilact, or the Pope himſelf, and knew as well as any man, what obedience is due to the definitions of a Council rightly conſummated and confirmed, as that of Nice was. Binius the great Collector of the Councils proves at large, that all this ſtory of the Carolin books and Frankford Synod aſſembled againſt that of Nice, is a groundleſs fiction. And ſo do Alanus, Surius, Vaſquez, and ſeveral other Doctors. And they are all amazed, whence the rumour ſhould ariſe, and by whom, and in what age or time. But I cannot wonder much at it, ſince I heard lately of a French Gentleman, who affirms and ſhows in a Book of his, that the Engliſh never conquered France, nor ever gave them any one overthrow in battle. And when he was told by a neighbour, of this his notorious falſhood; O, quoth he, my book two hundred years hence, may paſs for an authority as good as any that ſpeak otherwiſe. And ſo I think there may poſſibly be ſuch impious men, who out of their preſent malice may furniſh out a lie to infect poſterity, in after times. But he muſt be an unconſcionable wicked man who can do ſuch a deed.

§. 12. *Primitive Christians never used any images, as the learned of the Church of Rome acknowledge.* He had done well to let us know who are these learned of the Church of Rome. But he will not do us that favour. And we must still take his word for the judgment of the learned sort always. Nay we must believe too, that he is ever on the learned sorts side. It is indeed unlikely that figures of those holy persons, who first spread our Christianity in the world, and made it good both by their lives and death, should be frequent in primitive times. First, because those same figures, although they be honourable memories both of their persons and pieties, unto whose zeal and goodness we are so much indebted; yet are they not so necessarily requisite unto any such perpose, but that the Church can be without them. Secondly, because primitive Christians had not amongst them any such plenty of Artists, as we have now a days to make them. Thirdly, because Pagans would have mis-interpreted the end and meaning of such figures, as this our Doctor does in the midst of day-light. But that in those primitive times there was never any Christian so ill affected towards those pious representations as is Mr. Still. appears sufficiently by the testimony of those ancient Doctors, who mention incidentally the customs

of

to thoſe primitive times; eſpecially about the figure of the Croſs, which they made continually on their fore-head and breaſts, as a preſervative againſt evil, and kept it all over their houſes, particularly in their Bed-chambers and cloſets, either framed in wood or ſtone, or painted in colours. There be notwithſtanding the deluge of time which ſwallows up all things, ſome monuments yet left among us of the reſpect which thoſe Chriſtians then bore both to the reliques and figures of their Saints. The very chair of St. James the Apoſtle and firſt Biſhop of Jeruſalem, Euſebius in the ſeventh book of his hiſtory atteſts, that it was had in great eſteem and veneration in all times, even to his own days. Accordingly S. Clement in his ſixth book of apoſtolical conſtitutions gives this general teſtimony of that kind of piety in thoſe primitive Chriſtians, τῶν παρὰ θεῷ ξώντων καὶ τὰ λείψανα ἅτιμα, The very relicks, ſaith he, of Saints now living with God are not without their veneration. Some remainds there be alſo of an apoſtolical Council at Antioch, gathered out of S. Pamphilus and Origen, wherein caution is given both againſt the Jews malice and Gentile idols, by oppoſing the images of Jeſus and his holy followers againſt them both: Τὸ μὴ πλανᾶσθαι τοὺς σωζομένους ὑπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων, ἀλλ' ἀνθικνεμίζειν τὴν θεανδρι-

ἐνδειὴν ἄχραντον χειροποίητον στήλην τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ θεραπόντων ἀντικρὺ τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ Ἰουδαίων, καὶ μηκέτι πλανᾶσθαι εἰς εἴδωλα, μηδὲ ὁμοιοῦσαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.

Ignatius also that worthy apostolical Prelate, the third from St. Peter the Apostle in the chair at Antioch, thus signally speaks of the sign of the cross in his epistle to Philadelphia, ὁ γὰρ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου. &c. The Prince of this world, saith he, rejoices when any one denies the Cross: for he knows the confession of the cross to be his own ruin: this is the Standard against his power, which so often as he either sees or hears it spoken of, he shakes and trembles: thus speaks that glorious Prelate. The above named Eusebius testifies also in the same book of his history, that he saw even in his time the brazen Statue of our Lord Jesus, which was set up in Paneada in Palestin, unto his honour by the woman cured by him of the blood flix; so notable for miracles, that they were spoke of all the world over. This statue of our Lord when Julian the apostate caused it to be thrown down, and his own to be set up in place thereof, a strange sodain fire from heaven consumed the statue of Julian, as Zozomenus in his fift book witnesses. And of the same brazen statue of Christ our Lord write also

Theo-

Theophilact, Damaſcenus and ſeveral others. And here we may take notice by the way, that charity & devotion ſet up ſtatues to our Lord, but apoſtaſy & malice pulls them down. And whether Dr. Stillingfleet, who buſies himſelf ſo much to caſt down the images of Jeſus our Lord and his holy followers, would refuſe to have his own ſet up for his great pains, either in Guildhall or Cheapſide, he knows beſt himſelf. Truly if that were done, I do not believe that any of his neighbours or Countreymen would take him then for a calf of Bethel. Of the Images of the virgin Mary made by St. Luke there is much fame amongſt the antient writers, in particular Theodorus, Simeon Metaphraſtes and Nicephorus: The laſt of which does alſo atteſt in his ſecond book, that the ſaid precious relick was carried up and down the whole habitable world of Chriſtians, who looked npon it with a moſt greedy and unſatisfied devotion. The ſame Nicephorus adds moreover, how Conſtantius the Son of Conſtantine tranſlated the relicks of St. Luke from Thebes, of St Andrew from Achaia, and of St. Timothy from Epheſus, unto Conſtantinople, with a vaſt concourſe and joy of Chriſtian people: and there with all honour and reverential reſpect inſhrined them in a cathedral Church dedica-

ted to the Apoſtles. Of the image alſo of Chriſt our Lord imprinted by himſelf in a handkercher applied to his own face and ſent to King Abagarus who requeſted his picture, write Evagrius, Metaphraſtes and others. Of another image of Jeſus Chriſt made by Nicodemus, which being ignominiouſly crucified by the Jews wrought many wonderous miracles, we have a ſolemn teſtimony of Athanaſius cited in the fourth action of the ſeventh great Synod. And all this teſtifies that Chriſtians in primitive times were affected towards holy pictures and relicks as Catholicks are at this day: at leaſt not ſuch haters and vilifiers of them as is Dr. Stillingfleet. Nor can I conceive how any of the learned in the Church of Rome ſhould be ignorant of theſe things. Nay the very Church of England, which this Doctor pretends to defend, hath lately put the images of the Apoſtles and Primitive Saints into their common-prayer-book and Primers printed by authority. So that if the Doctor had opened his eyes, he might have ſeen clear enough, that all this talk of his is now unſeaſonable, however it might have paſſed well enough in the beginning of the furious reformation: when they pulled down all ſacred figures, and ſuffered none to be ſet up either ſacred or common.

When

When husbands broke their wives pictures, and wives their husbands, leaſt they ſhould give ill example to St. Peter and Paul, or incourage any of the twelve Apoſtles to creep up again upon their walls. When children in obedience and duty to their parents, ſpitting upon their effigies, ſaid as they were taught to ſay, I renounce the devil and all his works. When all the people flocked together in all places to tear down Churches and Chappels, and private oratories in houſes, with a Now boys, we are free men, let us eat, drink and play, for to morrow we ſhall dye. No more duty of any our daily prayers, no more faſting, no more vows, no more troubleſome adoration upon our knees, no more pining meditations, no more pennance, no more reſtitution, no more prieſt, no more altar, no more croſs or holy rood, no more Peter and Paul to be ſeen, no more languiſhing memories of Saints, no more obedience to the erring Church, no more ſelf-examination, no more conſcience ſcruples, &c. Thoſe times indeed were mad enough. But now people, as newly awaked from wine, begin to be wiſer and look more ſoberly about them. Even Denmark and Holland conſider now in cold blood the many ſad miſchiefs they acted in hot: nor is our own Countrey wholly

ignorant of the irreparable ruins of thoſe mad times. However, our Doctor will not have his ſport ſpoiled, nor yet his game ſtopt. Punchienella, though Bartholmew fair be ended, may be acted ſtill either in Lincolns Infields or Chairing crols or any where elſe, both now and then and ſeven years hence. It will be ſtill new to ſome body. He may alſo know that King James a wiſe and learned Prince in the year 1617. gave order that the pictures of Saints ſhould be ſet up in his Chappel of Holy-wood houſe in Edinborough, as Spotswood atteſts in his hiſtory of the Church of Scotland. And he cannot be ignorant that ſeveral times order and command has been given to Proteſtant people by our Engliſh Biſhops, that they bow and do reverence at the name of Jeſus, when its ſpoken or read in the Church. Now the name of Jeſus and figure of Jeſus is all one thing; the one of them repreſenting to the ear, what the other does to the eye. All this he might have conſidered. But his tongue is hot, and he muſt ſpeak although it be againſt himſelf, and the very Church he juſtifies, as much as it is againſt the Church he arraignes. Indeed his whole diſcourſe is ſo frivouſly ſubtile and ſubtilely frivolous, that no Church needs much to heed what he ſayes. This

I know and am certain of, that although he ſhould be confuted at large and confounded for ever by any Catholick Writer, yet ſhall we be never the nearer to any quietneſs and peace. For the next man that wants a rich benefice, will if he have but this mans confidence, collect another book of popiſh idolatry out of this book of Dr. Still. as he gather'd this of his out of Henry Moore, Jeremy Tailor and ſundry others his Predeceſſors; not heeding at all any anſwer that has been given by former Catholicks to the talk, any more than Dr. Stillingfleet does here. They will ever write, one out of another, and never regard what has been ſaid to any one of them in defence of that which they oppoſe, abecedarian ſcriblers. Nor can there be any end, ſo long as there is a biſhoprick or fat benefice to hope for: and Catholick hands ſo tied up, that they can print nothing unto their own juſtification without inſuperable difficulties and hazard.

I have read in *London* the Defiances of one Fencer to another, both of them in print. Who accordingly do meet in Bear-garden without any controul, there to baſte one another luſtily for the peoples pleaſure. And it would be a paſtime *I* think equally delightful, not leſs profitable, and ſomewhat more civil, to ſee two men reaſon down one another.

We

We poor men ſhould eſteem it a great favour to us, if our adverſary might read his charge and we our defence, even in Bear-garden. Since neither in Churches, Halls, Univerſities, or Schools are we permitted to ſpeak; or print any thing to ſpeak for us. And Doctor Stillingfleet who hath made his defiance already, may which he hath not yet done, appoint the day. Not men and fencers onely, but bulls and bears, cocks and dogs, all are permitted to defend themſelves when they are invaded, but onely we poor old Chriſtians whoſe Religion hath bleſſed our Land fifteen hundred years. As if it were agreed on all hands that we ſhould never be rightly underſtood.

Mr. H. Thorndike a grave Divine and and learned Doctor in our preſent Engliſh Church both affirms and ſtrongly proves in his book called *Juſt weights and meaſures*, that Roman Catholicks are idolaters no way: adding alſo, That they who ſeparate from the Church of Rome as Idolaters, are thereby ſchiſmaticks before God. Thus ſpeaks that learned man, the Phœnix of divines, who only dares to be honeſt. And the mere authority of this eminent Proteſtant may ſuffice to evacuate all the ſophiſtry of this whole chapter of this Doctors book:

as

as also of that which follows in the next place about our holy Hoſt and Saints.

Now Sir, I muſt bid you farewel. And that you may not think me either idle or negligent of my duty and reſpects to you, pray give me leave to tell you, that what you ſee here printed but now, was written and ready for the Preſs in Auguſt laſt. And before October ended *I* had finiſhed all my work upon Dr. Stillingfleets Book, ſuch-like familiar Commentaries, as theſe upon his firſt chapter be. But in all theſe ſix months *I* could get no more printed for you either at home or abroad, than this poor fifth part of the whole, after my many travels, vexations, expences and dangers. Such obſtructions are made about the Preſſes, and ſo many violences offered here continually, far above any uſed ſince we were born, that *I* can ſee no poſſibility for any whole book of ours to ſhoot that gulf, be our cauſe never ſo innocent and good. Nay, they will here print our catholick books themſelves, as if they were their own, as Thomas a Kempis, Granada, Parſons Reſolutions, Drexellius, and the like. But if we be taken printing them, the PRESS is broken, PRINTER puniſhed, and we, if we be found, in danger of our lives. And therefore I beſeech you, Sir, be con-

content with thus much, or rather this little. The reſt you ſhall have in written hand. In the mean time let Dr. Still. triumph and crow as he pleaſes. He is made and has made himſelf ſure enough. Although he hath defied the whole catholick world, and all that know of it, having ſomething to ſay, are both willing and ready, yet will no man come forth into the open field againſt him, becauſe they cannot. He thinks himſelf wiſe no doubt; wiſer than millions of men: and may do ſo ſtill. For my part, Sir, I find him as wiſe as one man; and no more. Farewel.

FINIS.